

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14-17, 19-21, 24-29, and 31-34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 10, 13, 22-23, and 30 have been canceled. Claims 1, 11-12, 14, 16, 24, 26, and 32 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. A replacement abstract is also submitted. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 26, 28-30, and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,088,598 to Marsolais ("Marsolais") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,431 to Tsunami et al. ("Tsumani").

Independent claim 1 relates to a method for setting operational parameters of a mobile terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, determining, by the mobile terminal, a distance parameter value, and wherein the steps of determining operational parameters in the terminal and setting the determined operational parameters are performed if the distance parameter value indicates that the mobile terminal is located within a location zone. In addition, the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami fails to disclose comparing the distance parameter value with a reference value for indicating whether the mobile terminal is located within the location zone.

Marsolais discloses a method and apparatus for displaying greetings to mobile terminals identifying services associated with location based services. A system identifies a plurality of service zones and transmits predefined services to mobile terminals when located in the service zones. The system transmits from each base station local zone profile information to each of the mobile terminals located in those zones. Each mobile terminal has stored therein subscriber zone profile information for which that mobile terminal can receive location based services. The mobile terminal also stores an associated greeting for each zone of subscriber zone profile information. The mobile terminal compares transmitted local zone information with a list of stored subscriber zone profile information, and when a match is found, the mobile terminal displays the greeting associated with the subscriber zone profile information.

Tsunami discloses an information communicating method. Various kinds of presentation information specific to an area can be transmitted to one or more radio-communication terminals at the same time. A user is able to receive commercial information, for example, from an information provider as presentation information when a user enters a location-registration area. A user terminal transmits a request for a location registration. The location-registration area and a terminal ID are transmitted to an information providing apparatus. The information providing apparatus searches a database for presentation-information ID by using a subscriber ID and the location-registration area information as pair of keys. The presentation information is then transmitted to the terminal through a USCCH channel and displayed on a display unit of the terminal.

In contrast to claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion by the combination of Marsolais and Tsunami of determining, by the mobile terminal, a distance parameter value and comparing the distance parameter value with a reference value for indicating whether the mobile terminal is located within the location zone. In Marsolais, when a mobile terminal is in a cell, an associated private system identities (PSID) list for that cell is broadcast. On acquiring this information, the mobile terminal will compare the broadcast PSID list for that cell with the stored list associated with that terminal. The comparison as disclosed in Marsolais is performed between the broadcast PSID list for the cell and the stored list associated with the terminal and not between the distance parameter value and the reference value for indicating whether the mobile terminal is located within the location zone as claimed. Tsunami fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 10 and 13 have been canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Dependent claims 3-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 14-15 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 3-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 14-15 distinguish over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 3-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 14-15 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 26 relates to a zone information transmitter for signaling a zone information. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 26, namely, wherein a zone information transmitter is adapted to negotiate a reference value with a mobile terminal, wherein the reference value is provided for a comparison with a distance parameter value to indicate whether the mobile terminal is located within the location zone. In contrast to claim 26, in Marsolais, when a mobile terminal is in a cell, an associated private system identities (PSID) list for that cell is broadcast. On acquiring this information, the mobile terminal will compare the broadcast PSID list for that cell with the stored list associated with that terminal. The comparison as disclosed in Marsolais is performed between the broadcast PSID list for the cell and the stored list associated with the terminal and not between the distance parameter value and the reference value for indicating whether the mobile terminal is located within the location zone as claimed. Tsunami fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 26 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 30 has been canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Dependent claims 28-29 depend from and further restrict independent claim 26 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 26, dependent claims 28-29 distinguish over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 28-29 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 32 relates to a method for setting operational parameters of a mobile terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, determining a distance parameter indicative of a distance of the mobile terminal to a location zone. In addition, the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami fails to disclose determining an indication, whether the mobile terminal is located within a location zone, by comparing the distance parameter value with a reference value. Marsolais discloses that when a mobile terminal is in a cell, an associated private system identities (PSID) list for that cell is broadcast. On acquiring this information, the mobile terminal will

compare the broadcast PSID list for that cell with the stored list associated with that terminal. The comparison as disclosed in Marsolais is performed between the broadcast PSID list for the cell and the stored list associated with the terminal and not between the distance parameter value and the reference value as claimed. Tsunami fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 32 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 33-34 depend from and further restrict independent claim 32 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 32, dependent claims 33-34 distinguish over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 33-34 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of Tsunami and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,330 to Alberty et al. ("Alberty"). Claim 7 depends from and further restricts independent claim 1 and therefore also distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais and Tsunami. In rejecting claim 7, the Examiner has further applied Alberty. Alberty has been cited as teaching a second transmission means that is deactivated by setting transmission parameters. Applicant respectfully submits that Alberty fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais and Tsunami noted above with respect to independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 7 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Alberty and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Claims 16, 18-25, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of Tsunami and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,816 to Shinoda et al. ("Shinoda").

Independent claim 16 relates to a mobile terminal having operational parameter settings. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 16, namely, wherein a second transmission means is provided for a communication

with a mobile radio system adapted to determine a distance parameter value indicative of a distance of the mobile terminal to a location zone. In addition, the combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda fails to disclose wherein the mobile terminal is adapted to determine an indication, whether the mobile terminal is located within a location zone, by comparing the distance parameter value with a reference value. Marsolais discloses that when a mobile terminal is in a cell, an associated private system identities (PSID) list for that cell is broadcast. On acquiring this information, the mobile terminal will compare the broadcast PSID list for that cell with the stored list associated with that terminal. The comparison as disclosed in Marsolais is performed between the broadcast PSID list for the cell and the stored list associated with the terminal and not between the distance parameter value and the reference value as claimed. Tsunami and Shinoda fail to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 22-23 have been canceled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Dependent claims 19-21 and 24-25 depend from and further restrict independent claim 16 in a patentable sense. Dependent claim 31 depends from and further restrict independent claim 26 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 16 and 26, respectively, dependent claims 19-21, 24-25, and 31 distinguish over the cited combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 19-21, 24-25, and 31 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of Tsunami further in view of Shinoda and further in view of Alberty. Claim 17 depends from and further restricts independent claim 16 and therefore also distinguishes over Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda. In rejecting claim 17, the Examiner has further applied Alberty. Alberty has been cited as teaching a second transmission means that is deactivated by setting transmission parameters. Applicant respectfully submits that Alberty fail to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Shinoda noted above with respect to independent claim 16. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 17

distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, Shinoda, and Alberty and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsolais in view of Tsunami and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078354 to Pass ("Pass"). Claim 27 depends from and further restricts independent claim 26 and therefore also distinguishes over Marsolais and Tsunami. In rejecting claim 27, the Examiner has further applied Pass. Pass has been cited as teaching a wireless server. Applicant respectfully submits that Pass fails to cure the deficiencies of Marsolais and Tsunami noted above with respect to independent claim 26. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 27 distinguishes over the cited combination of Marsolais, Tsunami, and Pass and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: Nov 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stanley R. Moore

Registration No.: 26,958

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant